

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS, Washington, D.C. 20221 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/489,929	01/24/2000	Richard A. Lodge	9-13528-77US	6470
20988 7	590 05/22/2002			
OGILVY RENAULT 1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE SUITE 1600			EXAMINER	
			TRAN, PABLO N	
MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3 CANADA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	·		2684	
			DATE MAILED: 05/22/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		· /
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Comment	09/489,929	LODGE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Pablo N Tran	2684
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with t	ne correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS be, cause the application to become ABAND	pe timely filed ) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05</u>	March 2002 .	
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Th	nis action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application	n	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6) Claim(s) <u>1-18,21-38 and 41-52</u> is/are rejected		
7) Claim(s) <u>19-20,39-40,53-54</u> is/are objected to		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o		
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	pted or b)  objected to by the I	Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on		pproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in re		
12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	9(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority document		
2. Certified copies of the priority document		
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior</li> <li>application from the International But</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	ıreau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest	ic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language pro	·	
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Infor	mary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) mal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/489,929

Art Unit: 2684

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 03/05/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the Applicant's arguments, Applicant's stated "Marturano et al. fail to disclosed the step of at least temporary interrupting data transmission over the poorly performing wireless link". Marturano et al. disclosed temporary interrupting data transmission over the poorly performing wireless link until the adequate data blocks is received (col. 4/ln. 8-49).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States
- 3. Claims 1-2, 21-22, and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Marturano et al.* (5,636,230).

As per claims 1, 21, and 41, *Marturano et al.* disclosed a base station (fig. 1/no. 102-103, col. 2/ln. 49) being adapted for communications with one or more wireless terminals (fig. 1/no. 101, col. 2/ln. 47) over a wireless link wherein the base station

Application/Control Number: 09/489,929

Art Unit: 2684

identify a poorly performing link and temporarily interrupting data transmission over the poorly performing wireless link (abstract, col. 2/ln. 58-col. 4/ln. 15).

As per claims 2, 22, and 42, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed monitoring one or more performance parameters related to each wireless link and comparing each monitoring performance parameters to a respective predetermined threshold (col. 3/ln. 9-19).

As per claims 3-4, 13, 23-24, 33, 43-44, and 49, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed the performance parameters related to each wireless link are based on interference on the wireless link and comprises any one or more of a S/N ratio, a user data throughput rate, a C/I ratio, a BER ratio, or a number of suspend frames (col. 3/ln. 65-col. 4/ln. 7).

As per claims 5, 25, and 45, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed an average, taken over a number of successive burst, of any one or more of the S/N ratio, the C/I ratio, the user data throughput rate, or the BER ratio (col. 4/ln. 26-33).

As per claims 6, 14, 26, 34, 46, and 50, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed suspending transmission of a data frame over the poorly performing wireless link (col. 2/ln. 58-col. 4/ln. 15, where it is clear that the block of data is dropped when it is determined that it has been inadequately received and a request to re-transmitted the block of data).

As per claims 7 and 27, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed resuming transmission of the data frame after a delay period (col. 4/ln. 8-15).

Application/Control Number: 09/489,929

Art Unit: 2684

As per claims 8, 16, 28, 36, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed the delay period is of random length (col. 4/ln. 16-40, where it is clear that the delay period is of random length due to the fact that until the portion of adequate data blocks has been received prior to the re-send counter has been reached).

As per claims 9, 17, 29, 37, 47, and 51, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed maintaining a count of dropped frames (col. 4/ln. 16-49, where it is clear that the counter keeps track of inadequate (dropped) received data blocks, see explanation in claim 6).

As per claims 10, 18, 30, 38, 48, and 52, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed suspending transmission if the count of suspended frames exceeds a predetermined threshold (col. 4/ln. 50-54).

As per claims 15 and 35, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed re-transmitting the dropped frame after a delay period (col. 4/ln. 40-49).

As per claim 11 and 31, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed restarting the transmission after a delay period (col. 4/ln. 63-col. 5/ln. 12).

As per claims 12 and 32, *Marturano et al.* further disclosed the delay is of random length (col. 4/ln. 63-col. 5/ln. 12).

# Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 19-20, 39-40, and 53-54 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 09/489,929 Page 5

Art Unit: 2684

### Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Scholefield et al. (5,752,193), Dupont (5,729,542), Marin et al. (5,936,940), Kilkki et al. (6,011,778), Behtash et al. (5,745,480), Marsan et al. (6,131,049), and Kingdon et al. (6,078,818) disclose method for controlling QOS level parameters in a radiotelephone system.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pablo Tran whose telephone number is (703)308-7941. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Hunter, can be reached at (703)308-6732.

## Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

### or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2684

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

May 18, 2002

PABLO N. TRAN

PATENT EXAMINER